

Editorial

Due to one of those lucky circumstances that at times happens in the life of researchers, during the period I headed the PhD programme and the Centre of Anthropology of the Text at the University of Macerata, some young scholars happened to participate to both activities; coming from different experiences, they shared a common path according to the principles of philology, interpretation and theory of the literature.

This is how it was born *Polythesis*, an online journal, as it is natural to be nowadays, to follow up, share and broaden the interests and the horizons, not purely for a national audience, of that thing which, with a bit of emphasis, could be defined a research community.

There has not been the time, or perhaps the will, to elaborate a theory, or a doctrine or a systematic method of approach to the analysis of literature, but, rather, each one of us, with their own personal accent, contributed to reflect on an assumption that it may seem trivial in its formulation, but which is often overlooked: that the texts are made by human beings. We say texts, implying literary ones, whatever this adjective may mean throughout the course of the historic development and of the different cultures, (even if our compass clearly pivots around the European tradition, where we come from), without distinction of oral, written or other means with which they have been realised. We say made, and not produced or created, precisely to avoid the extremely opposed implications of the economic and sociologic idea and of the intellectualistic and irrationalistic idea of doing literature. We say human beings not only to overcome, it should be obvious nowadays, the gender differences, that must not, however, be underestimated, but also to point out an anthropological horizon which the reflection on the texts can be traced back to.

The tripartite subtitle of the journal, in our intentions, stresses at the same time three research perspectives, three requirements that we would always want to be interconnected. *Philology*, referring to the scrupulous attention to the textual dictation, is preliminary to every *interpretation*, which confronts itself with the semantic density of the literary works and with their place in life, in the dialectic process in which they are determined and determining in relation to the context; finally, *theory* spurs the awareness of those who deal with literature, and the reflection on premises and foundations, on tools and methods in a dialogue with

the other text-related disciplinary epistemologies (linguistics, philosophy, cultural anthropology, visual arts, etc.).

The name *Polythesis* evokes, instead, the issues raised by the classifications, by the categories that we use, sometimes without thinking, to analyse literary texts: rather than a rigid, 'digital' approach, of a yes/no type, binary, oppositional, a priori, we prefer a more flexible, 'analogical' and observative one, a polythetic one indeed, of the kind of 'a greyscale', because we are convinced that intersections express, in a better way and more than barriers, the contradictory and polymorphic plurality of the ways with which the texts exist within world and time.

Philology, interpretation and theory of *literature*, therefore, reveal the convergence towards one of the forms, par excellence, with which human beings have given life to the relationship with themselves and with others.

Images, figures, behaviours, activities and representations have originated precisely from this relationship: for this reason, it is difficult to imagine a philology and an interpretation that are not, also, an anthropology of the texts; the philological act of restoring the texts to their context, to their becoming immediate, to the time of their genesis, should always be accompanied by the hermeneutic act of questioning the texts from our position, from our point of view, from our time, with our own questions, able to bring to light, in the most fortunate occasions, the universality and the variety of the answers to the fundamental human questions.

(Translated by G. M. Bonafin)